

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		BPA NO.	1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE 1	OF PAGES 35
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 03		3. EFFECTIVE DATE SEE BLOCK 16C	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. N/A	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY CODE		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE			
ACQUISITION AND ASSISTANCE OFFICE USAID/UGANDA P.O BOX 7856 KAMPALA UGANDA		ACQUISITION AND ASSISTANCE OFFICE USAID/UGANDA P.O BOX 7856 KAMPALA UGANDA			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)			(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. SOL-617-12-00021	
				9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)	
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE			

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

THE PURPOSE OF THIS MODIFICATION IS TO:

- 1) EXTEND THE CLOSING DATE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS FROM JANUARY 30, 2013 TO FEBRUARY 8, 2013
- 2) REVISE VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE SOLICITATION AND ADD ATTACHMENT J.17 AS DETAILED ON THE CONTINUATION PAGES.
- 3) POST RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS.
- 4) ISSUE AN AMMENDED SOLICITATION

[SEE CONTINUATION PAGES FOR DETAILS]

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) TRACY J. MILLER CONTRACTING OFFICER	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED

A. THE FOLLOWING ARE SPECIFIC CHANGES MADE TO THE SOLICITATION;

Revision No. 1

Cover Page: Extend the closing date for submission of proposals from January 30, 2013 to February 8, 2013.

Revision No. 2

PART I: Section B.4 entitled “Budget” Delete specified template and replace with the following;

B.4 BUDGET

CLIN	Cost Elements	Total (Year 1-5)
001	Component 1 a. Outcome – M & E system b. Outcome – Performance reporting system- \$500,000	
002	Component 2	
003	Component 2 –Learning Opportunities	\$1,500,000
004	Component 3	
005	Monitoring and Evaluation	
006	Sub Contracts	
007	Other Direct Costs*	
008	Indirect Costs	
	Total Estimated Cost	
009	Fixed Fee	
	Total Cost plus Fixed Fee	

(*) These are costs that support the four areas and cannot be segregated for CLINS 001-005

Revision No. 3

PART I: Section C, Sub Section 7.0 entitled “Monitoring, Evaluation and CLA” revise section narrative to now read as follows;

“7.0 MONITORING, EVALUATION AND CLA (10%)

7.1 Monitoring and Evaluation

While acknowledging the difficulty in establishing methods to capture fully the results and impact of investing in learning, in coordination with a tentative, multi-year work plan, the prime Learning Contractor shall develop an appropriate Performance Management Plan (PMP) that proposes a set of indicators that are associated with the program’s three components. Given the phased, inter-dependent nature of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning program, the PMP may evolve to respond to USAID/Uganda’s organizational capacity for enhanced monitoring and reporting, opportunities for learning and collaboration, and emerging demands. The Contractor, amongst other methods, shall consider the use of outcome mapping, social network analyses and other comprehensive approaches to understanding USAID’s staff and organizational development challenges to further define the Learning Contract’s program’s Results Framework, systems and behavioral enhancements expected from this intervention under Component Two.

The PMP shall serve as a road map with discrete landmarks, which will enable USAID management to establish how well the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning program is on track to achieve the anticipated short-term, medium-term and long-term results and what remedial actions could be taken. The PMP shall guide development of complementary tools that facilitate the following processes:

- Tracking progress in achieving outputs, results and reporting performance, including USAID’s organizational responsiveness and leadership commitment to support interventions honestly and openly, even when results are not what were expected.
- Involving stakeholders (including implementing partners, Learning Contract advisors and institutions) in assessing the quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of outputs.
- Assessing the reliability and quality of performance measures and correcting weaknesses when these are found.
- Questioning the underlying causal linkages between key Learning Contract’s activities and results and conducting evaluations and research that can identify ways to strengthen that link.
- Learning from both successes and failures.”

Revision No. 4

PART I: Section F.4.1, Sub Section 1.2 entitled “Contractor Deliverables”: Revise the second paragraph in its entirety to read as follows;

“This assessment will also establish available opportunities for engaging strategic, institutional and individual partners to advance USAID/Uganda’s Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning activities including potential Advisory Councils for the different sectors USAID supports. It should also include a short report on methods for augmenting the PRS’ current capacities. **An outline of this Assessment report will be submitted to USAID 45 days after the diagnostic study is initiated and a final report will be due not later than 120 days after the award of the contract.** The Contractor will keep in close contact with USAID either before or during the assessment process, making at least one interim presentation to USAID. This presentation will address emerging observations, constraints and rehearsing certain recommendations that will serve as key aspects of the Learning Contract’s proposed, multi-year work plan. A full presentation will be made by the assessment team to USAID’s senior management within 7 days of the submission of the complete draft organizational assessment report. USAID will give its formal feedback or concurrence approximately two weeks after the submission of the complete draft report, including approval of recommendations. The Contractor will not begin implementation of activities until after the USAID COR formally conveys USAID’s concurrence.”

Revision No. 5

PART I: Section E.4 entitled “Monitoring and Evaluation”: Delete last sentence of paragraph two that states that; “The COR and CO will discuss the COR recommendations and the CO will approve or disapprove the payment of fee” and revise entire paragraph to read as follows;

“The Contractor shall submit to the COR, for technical review, all information and appropriate documentation necessary to demonstrate and support the achievement of milestones. The Contractor shall also provide an explanation and/or justification if any milestones have not been achieved according to the schedule. The COR will lead a review of the documentation to determine if the milestones have been met.”

Revision No. 6

PART III: Section J: entitled “List of Attachments”: **Revise attachment J.10 entitled “Budget Template” (See revised attachment) and include the following new attachment;**

ATTACHMENT NUMBER	TITLE
J.17	USAID-Uganda CDCS 2011-2012 PMP

Revision No. 7

PART IV: Section L.8 entitled “Instructions for the Preparation of the Technical Proposal”, Paragraph 3 - part c: Revise statement to now read as follows;

“The cover page, table of contents, key personnel resumes, personnel statements of availability, dividers, and past performance report forms are not included in the page limitation. No material may be incorporated in the proposal by reference, attachment, appendix, etc. to circumvent the page limitation. Pages that exceed the page limitation shall not be evaluated.”

Revision No. 8

PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled “The Technical Proposal Shall Include the Following Information”, Part A entitled “Technical Approach”, Sub Part b entitled “Proposed Interventions”: Respective to component 2: Revise the following statement: “**Addressing the questions cited in section C.8.2, the Offeror shall;**” to now read as follows;

“**The Offeror shall;**”

Revision No. 9

PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled: “Annexes shall be presented in the following order”; Increase the page limit for Annex E entitled: “Management Structure Organizational Charts” from 1 page to 4 pages maximum.

Revision No. 10

PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled “The Technical Proposal Shall Include the Following Information”, Part A entitled “Technical Approach” Sub Part b entitled “Proposed Interventions”: Respective to component 1: Open access to the web based Performance Reporting System dummy site with effect from January 21, 2013 through to February 8, 2013 and revise entire section narrative to now read as follows;

“The Offeror shall specifically address the following and in detail:

Respective to Component 1:

The Offeror shall;

- Describe methods for strengthening USAID/Uganda’s monitoring and evaluation performance incorporating specific strategies on how to enable the Mission meet the agency requirements.
- Define specific ways in which special Presidential Initiative M&E requirements and pioneering methods for ascertaining progress within USAID/Uganda’s development objectives.

Without necessarily focusing on any of the three mentioned options in Section C, the Offeror shall propose features and functionalities of a PRS that meets Mission needs for enhanced data visualization, GIS and smart information management and shall also describe strategies for

rolling out and cultivating use of this system within the Mission and by other relevant stakeholders.

A maximum of \$500,000 shall be devoted towards the assessment of the existing system and Mission's needs, development of recommended solutions, roll out and maintenance of the selected system. Offerors are at this time not required to provide a cost break down of this figure.

Offerors are encouraged to view the web based Performance Reporting System (PRS) through a dummy site accessible at the following link: http://memsdatabase.com/uganda_prs_test/. The dummy site shall be accessible to all interested parties with effect from January 18, 2013 through to February 8, 2013 using the following log in information: Username = testaccount Password = Ugand@1 (The password is case sensitive).

- Describe how it plans to conduct or offer performance evaluation services, 'proof of concept' studies and other applied, practical research exercises to help the Mission identify promising, integrated and replicable approaches. Innovative methods on how relations will be built with USAID staff and implementing partners in implementation of the Learning Contract's program".

Revision No. 11

PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled "The Technical Proposal Shall Include the Following Information"; Part A entitled "Technical Approach" Sub Part C: Change title from "**Performance Management Plan (PMP)**" to "**Monitoring, Evaluation and CLA**" and revise section narrative to now read as follows;

"C) Monitoring, Evaluation and CLA;

The offeror shall submit a draft PMP (Annex A) that tracks improvements in M&E systems and performance, enhanced organizational collaboration and learning capacity and development effectiveness.

The PMP is a management tool that enables the Offeror and USAID to monitor the progress of program activities towards achieving stated deliverables and objectives. Offerors shall propose an illustrative Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and utilize the illustrative indicators in the SOW indicating how they intend to comprehensively track progress towards achieving the program outcomes and impacts. The Contractor is encouraged to propose additional indicators (including qualitative) reflective of improved M&E systems and performance, enhanced organizational collaboration and learning capacity and development effectiveness for measurement of the anticipated changes.

The PMP shall:

- Define specific performance indicators for the different levels of program results.
- Present baseline values, annual targets and end of program targets for each of the three Learning program components for the proposed performance indicators. These values and targets should also be informed by the initial organizational diagnostics and studies. Proposed targets should be linked to the Mission PMP targets, where appropriate.

- Cite data collection methods and frequency of data collection for each indicator. The Contractor should consider the use of innovative methods and qualitative techniques like most significant change, satisfaction surveys, data visualization, social network analyses, or knowledge audits that can best capture the types of system-wide information about reporting, learning and collaborating for enhancing USAID/Uganda performance.
- Demonstrate how learning and adaptation will be integrated into the learning program. Opportunities for independent reviews, evaluations and other mechanisms for establishing program effectiveness, key lessons and impact of the Learning program should be described. Note that evaluations cited here do not include particular project or activity evaluations and studies conducted on behalf of USAID or the IPs.
- Demonstrate how performance information could be most usefully shared with key USAID/Uganda stakeholders, particularly USAID/Washington which is especially interested in how USAID/Uganda believes it can use an organizational support and learning program to enhance internal USAID program implementation and strategic decision-making capacities.”

Revision No. 12

PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled “The Technical Proposal Shall Include the Following Information”; Part B entitled “Key Personnel”: Revise section narrative to now read as follows;

“The Contractor shall propose personnel necessary to effectively carry out the requirements of the contract, clearly identifying the long-term and short-term positions/personnel. The Contractor shall utilize locally available personnel, including short-term consultants for all positions, tasks and scopes of work for which human resources with appropriate prior training and experience are locally available.

Note: Although USAID/Uganda perceives the Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management Adviser roles to be inherently linked and best executed as a consolidated position, USAID recognizes that it can be challenging to find experienced professionals who traverse several sub-disciplines and as such, Offerors shall make their best proposal addressing the requirements of the Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management Advisor position. Offerors that propose to split this role should however note that only the Organizational Learning Advisor position shall be key personell.

Key Personnel shall meet the minimum requirements specified in Section C. Key personnel are those individuals whose performance is critical to the success of the contract.

All key personnel shall demonstrate significant expertise, work experience and professional accomplishments that are directly related to the technical scope of the Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation Program and consistent with the Offeror’s proposed technical approach. USAID/Uganda reserves the right to determine whether experience is significant and relevant.

The Offeror shall submit a current resume (maximum 3 pages/person) (**Annex B**) for each of the Key Personnel, highlighting the candidate’s education, work experience and professional accomplishments and highlighting elements which are directly relevant to the technical scope and objectives of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Program. The offeror shall submit references with contact information for all proposed key personnel. USAID reserves the right to contact other professional references not included on the list provided by the Offeror.

Please note that Offerors are not required to submit Resumes for persons other than Key Personnel

Revision No. 13

PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled “The Technical Proposal Shall Include the Following Information”, Part D entitled “Past Performance”: Revise to now read as follows;

“D) Past Performance

The offeror’s past performance information shall include the following:

- I. Quality of the offeror’s performance on past or similar activities.
 - II. Consistency in meeting goals and targets, and cooperation and effectiveness in addressing challenges.
 - III. Cost control, including forecasting costs as well as accuracy in financial reporting.
 - IV. Timeliness of performance, including adherence to contract schedules and other time-sensitive project conditions, and effectiveness of home and field office management to make prompt decisions and ensure efficient operations.
 - V. Business relations, addressing the history of professional behavior and overall business-like concern for the interests of the customer, including coordination among subcontractors and developing country partners, cooperative attitude in remedying problems, and timely completion of all administrative requirements.
 - VI. Customer satisfaction with performance, including end user or beneficiary wherever possible.
 - VII. Effectiveness of key personnel including appropriateness of personnel for the job and prompt, satisfactory changes in personnel when problems with clients were identified.
- (a) The Offeror shall provide past performance; information for itself and each major subcontractor (whose proposed cost equals 20% or more of the Offeror’s total proposed cost or any sub-contractor, which shall have principle responsibility for implementing one or more of the program components/deliverables or results area regardless of dollar value) in accordance with the following:
1. List in an annex (**Annex C**) to the technical proposal five (5) of the most recent and relevant contracts for efforts similar to the work in the subject proposal (with specification of whether the work was being done as a prime contract or a subcontract).
 2. Offerors shall provide for each of the contracts listed the following information regarding its past or current performance: (1) scope of work; (2) primary location of work; (3) Term of Performance; (4) skills/expertise required; (5) contract amount; and (6) technical contact person and Email address. Offerors/subcontractors must either provide this information or affirmatively state that it possesses no information directly relevant to similar past performance.
- (b) The Government reserves the right to verify the experience and past performance record of cited projects or other recent projects by reviewing Contractor Performance Reports (CPR’s), other performance reports, or to interview cited references or other persons knowledgeable of the Offeror’s performance on a particular project. The Government may check any or all cited references to verify supplied information and/or to assess

reference satisfaction with performance. References may be asked to comment on items such as: Quality of Product or Service, Cost Control, Timeliness of Performance, Customer Satisfaction, and Key Personnel. Offerors shall be provided an opportunity to explain circumstances surrounding less than satisfactory performance reports if not previously provided the opportunity.

- (c) If Offerors or their proposed Subcontractors encountered problems on any of the referenced contracts, they may provide a short explanation and the corrective action taken. Offerors shall not provide general information on their performance.
- (d) Offerors may describe any quality award or certification that indicates exceptional capacity to provide the service or product described in the statement of work. This information shall be included in other Attachments under **Annex H**.
- (e) Offerors must either provide the above information or affirmatively state that it possesses no relevant, directly related or similar past performance. Similar statements also are required for any proposed major Subcontractors having no past performance history.”

Revision No. 14

PART IV: Section M.3, Sub Section M.3.1 entitled “Technical Evaluation Criteria”, Criterion 1 entitled “Technical Approach”: Revise Criterion to now read as follows;

“Criterion 1: Technical Approach (Sub criteria are of equal importance)

- 1. Implementation Strategy:
 - a) Demonstrated understanding of common monitoring, evaluation and learning issues affecting USAID and the extent to which the Offeror provides a clear, technically sound and feasible approach to produce promising, measurable and sustainable results.
 - b) Information Management and Technology Development: Ability to present pioneering methods for developing evidence and visually-oriented information management and reporting systems that meets users’ needs, and enhances program policy decision making.
- 2. Organizational Learning and Development: The Offeror’s ability to present a responsive, holistic approach to advancing staff development, knowledge management, learning and enhanced productivity. Considered will be the Offeror’s capacity to demonstrate how advancing key interventions for each component will enable USAID to refine strategy implementation, augment learning and make program course corrections.
- 3. Collaboration: The extent to which the Offeror demonstrates ability to collaborate with local organizations, government institutions, NGOs and private sector partners for strengthening collaboration, developing new professional relationships and local capacity development.”

Revision No. 15

PART IV: Section M, Sub Section M.3.1, Criterion 3 entitled “Institutional Capability”: Revise Criterion to read as follows;

“Criterion 3: Institutional Capability (Sub criteria are of equal importance)

1. The extent to which the Offeror demonstrates institutional experience for programs of a comparable size, scale, duration, nature and complexity and a plan for management of this complex monitoring, evaluation and learning program .
2. The extent to which the draft work plan reflects the Offeror’ s appreciation for USAID/Uganda’s complex organization, implementation and decision-making environment and implements proposed activities for promoting positive M&E, organizational change in a rapid yet effective manner.
3. Quality of prospective partner organizations, including leading regional or Ugandan academic and research bodies and key Ugandan government entities to serve as key learning partners.”

B. THE FOLLOWING ARE RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS;

- 1) Please confirm that Geographic Code 935 is the correct code for this solicitation. Per USAID AAPD 12-3 (Revision of 22 CFR 228 Source and Nationality), "Solicitations issued on/after March 1, 2012 to which 22 CFR 228 applies must reflect the new default Geographic Code of 937 (unless another geographic code is authorized per 22 CFR 228)."

Response: Yes, Geographic Code 935 is correct; both under PEPFAR and under the Development Fund for Africa exception set forth in Section 496(n)(4) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

- 2) (Reference p. 44) This page states that "The authorized geographic code for procurement of goods and services under this contract is 935." Can USAID confirm if this is the correct geographic code?

Response: See response to question 1 above.

- 3) On Page 97 of the RFP, Section L.8 Instructions for the Preparation of the Technical Proposal, bio-data sheets are included as one of the forms that are not included in the page limitation for the technical volume. This is the language from page 97 "(c) The cover page, table of contents, key personnel resumes, personnel statements of availability, bio-data sheets, dividers, and past performance report forms are not included in the page limitation." Please confirm that biographical data forms are not to be included in the technical volume at all (given that these forms include cost information in them) and confirm that they are only required to be included in the cost/business proposal.

Response: Bio data sheets shall be submitted as part of the cost proposal. See revision to Part IV: Section L.8 entitled "Instructions for the Preparation of the Technical Proposal", Paragraph 3 - part C.

- 4) Section L.8(c) (page 97) indicates that bio-data sheets will not be included in the page limitation for the technical proposal. Please confirm that bio-data sheets are to be included in the technical volume as opposed to the cost volume.

Response: See response to question 3 above.

- 5) page 97 of the RFP, Section L.8 (c) states "The cover page, table of contents, key personnel resumes, personnel statements of availability, bio-data sheets, dividers, & past performance report forms are not included in the page limitation." Given that bio-data sheets contain pricing information which is prohibited from inclusion in the Technical Proposal, can you please confirm that bio-data sheets should only be included in the Cost Proposal & should not be included as an annex to the Technical Proposal?

Response: See response to question 3 above.

- 6) Can you please confirm that a cover letter and an acronym list will also not count against the 30 page limit?

Response: A cover letter and list of acronyms shall not be counted as part of the 30 page technical proposal limit but shall not however exceed 1 page each.

- 7) In Section L.8(c) (page 97) please confirm that a list of acronyms is not included in the 30 page limit.

Response: See response to question 6 above.

- 8) Section L.8(c) (page 97) does not mention Executive Summary in the list of items that are not included in the page limitation for the technical proposal, but farther down the page the instructions indicate that an Executive Summary (exclusive of the 30 page limit) shall follow the Table of Contents. Please confirm that a 1-2 page Executive Summary will not be counted against the page limitation for the technical proposal.

Response: A 1-2 page executive summary shall not be counted as part of the 30 page technical proposal limit. Any executive summary material above 2 pages shall however be counted as part of the 30 page technical proposal limit.

- 9) Can USAID please provide offerors with a copy of the Local Compensation Plan?

Response: While USAID does not typically make available this information to the public, a summary range of grades with effect from August 26, 2012 is hereby provided for your guidance:

✚	Grade 12- Maximum Ugx.is 126,822,273
✚	Grade 10- Maximum Ugx.is 76,970,919
✚	Grade 8- Maximum Ugx.is 51,440,721
✚	Grade 6- Maximum Ugx.is 32,751,413
✚	Grade 4- Maximum Ugx.is 25,191,772
✚	Grade 2- Maximum Ugx.is 20,272,059

- 10) On page 50 of the RFP, Section H.23 Employment of Third Country Nationals and Cooperating Country Nationals, section (b) states “Unless otherwise approved by the Contracting Officer, the maximum prevailing compensation shall be the same as the maximum salary under the Uganda Mission Local Compensation Plan.” In order to ensure compliance with this requirement, would you please provide a copy of the Uganda Mission LCP?

Response: See response to question 9 above.

- 11) Can USAID please confirm how many references should be submitted for each key personnel?

Response: For each identified key personnel, Offerors shall provide E-mail and telephone contact information of not less than three references.

12) Would you please confirm that Offerors should submit 3 references for each of the five key personnel?

[Response: See response to question 11 above.](#)

13) Page 101 of the RFP indicates that offerors shall submit five past performance references for the prime contractor and any major subcontractors in Annex C. Does USAID expect offerors to include any additional past performance information within the 30 page technical, perhaps in the form of a narrative?

[Response: A past performance narrative addressing the requirements under Section L.8: Part D Sub Part I - VI entitled "Past Performance" shall be submitted and counted as part of the 30 page technical proposal limit whereas a past performance matrix listing five \(5\) of the most recent and relevant contracts shall be submitted as Annex C to the technical proposal and shall not be counted as part of the 30 page technical proposal limit.](#)

[See revision to PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled "The Technical Proposal Shall Include the Following Information"; Part D entitled "Past Performance."](#)

14) On page 98 of the RFP, Past Performance is included as an item in the technical proposal (point D.), as well as an attachment (Annex C). Given that the requirements included in section L.8 D) Past Performance seem to refer to the elements that will be included in the past performance matrix included in Annex C, can you please confirm that no separate past performance information is required for inclusion in the 30-page Technical Proposal?

[Response: See response to question 13 above.](#)

15) (Reference Section L, p. 98-101) The instructions state that the technical proposal is a maximum of 30 pages and that Section D of the proposal is Past Performance. Page 101, however, states that Past Performance is to be presented in Annex C. Can USAID clarify that Past Performance is to be presented in Annex C and thus does not count against the 30-page limit for the technical proposal?

[Response: See response to question 13 above.](#)

16) Reference: Section L.8.3 Technical Proposal, Page 98 of 114 and L.8.D.a.1, Past Performance, Page 101 of 114. The solicitation instructs, "The technical proposal shall be organized as follows: A. Technical Approach; B. Key Personnel; C. Institutional Capacity; D. Past Performance; and E. Annexes. However, page 101 reads, "List in an annex (Annex C) to the technical proposal five (5) of the most recent and relevant contracts for efforts similar to the work..." Please clarify what information the government wishes to see in item D. Past Performance in the technical proposal.

[Response: See response to question 13 above.](#)

- 17) (Reference: Section L, p. 101) Please confirm that information about the 5 most relevant past performance references should be included in Annex C, following the Past Performance Matrix.

Response: See response to question 13 above.

- 18) Page 103 A. Salary and Wages requests that Biographical Data Sheets are required for long-term, short-term expatriate personnel and all long-term cooperating country personnel being proposed. As this assignment will likely require a high volume of short-term expatriate personnel over the life of the contract, would USAID consider waiving the requirement to submit 1420s for short-term expatriate personnel, and instead allow offerors to propose illustrative daily rates in the cost proposal?

Response: Offerors are required to submit Bio data sheets for all key personnel including all short term expatriate personnel and consultants as well as all long term cooperating country personnel identified at the time of submitting the proposal as specified in Section L.9, Cost Proposal, Section 2 (a) and in accordance with AIDAR 752.7001.

At the time of proposal, anticipated short term consultants and personnel not identified by name shall only have estimated/illustrative costs/fees included and explained in the cost proposal.

- 19) Can offerors include CVs for proposed staff members who are not key personnel in Annex B?

Response: CVs/Resumes are only required for proposed KEY personnel.

- 20) Reference: Section B.4, Budget, Page 8 of 114 and Section C.5.1.2, Component 2: Improved Learning and Adaptation, Page 17 of 114. The solicitation reads, "A minimum of \$1.5 million over the life of this program shall be devoted towards activities to respond to unanticipated emerging learning issues including those that may come from the assessment and any other partnership, training and learning opportunities that may arise during the course of the Contract." A) What costs does the government include in this figure? B) For example, does the government anticipate a budget that includes miscellaneous Personnel Costs? C) Does the government anticipate a budget that includes miscellaneous Other Direct Costs? D) Is the \$1.5 million only direct costs, or does it include the bidder's indirect rate structure?

Response: A) All costs related to these activities. B) Offerors are not required to break down the \$ 1.5 million plug figure into various cost elements in the proposal. C) The \$ 1.5 million plug figure shall be represented as a lump sum amount on the Offerors budget spreadsheet with cost elements determined as and when the learning opportunities arise during time of implementation. D) The \$1.5 is to cover all costs for approved activities during the period of the award.

- 21) Section 5.1.2 on page 17 of the RFP requires that a minimum of \$1.5 million be devoted to Learning Opportunities. Section B.4 on page 8 of the RFP contains a \$1.5 million “plug-figure” for these Learning Opportunities in CLIN 003. A) Could USAID confirm that the \$1.5 million can be allocated to both STTA labor and other direct costs for supporting learning opportunities identified over the course of the contract? B) Or, alternatively, does USAID envision that the \$1.5 million will be treated more like a “grants under contract” program?

Response: A) The activities that we envision/anticipate under this particular outcome may require STTA. USAID/Uganda does not want to restrict the Contractor in determining the approach for achievement of the outcomes, therefore may be the need for STTA or other avenues for these learning activities. However, the Contractor will need to coordinate with the COR and seek approval in advance for utilization of the funds from the COR. B) See response to part A & response to question 20 above.

- 22) Please provide clarification whether the offeror should submit the Summary CLIN budget using the template provided on page 8 of the solicitation, Section B4. BUDGET or the template provided under Attachment_J_10_-_Budget_format(1).xlsx?

The template under Section B.4 entitled “Budget” shall only be populated by USAID at contract award. Offerors shall provide all budget information under solicitation attachment J.10 entitled “Budget Template” Please note that the lines provided in the budget template are minimum required inputs. The offeror may add additional lines, as necessary, to provide clarity to the proposed budget. **See revised attachment J.10 entitled “Budget Template.”**

- 23) Section 5.1.1 states that Component 1 will be 45% of the contract. Section 5.1.2 states that Component 2 will be 30% of the contract. Section 5.1.3 states that Component 3 will be 15% of the contract. This totals 90%. Section 7.0 appears to bring the total to 100% by showing a 10% number for Monitoring, Evaluation and CLA. A) Could USAID confirm that it anticipates approximately 10% of the overall effort being put toward the M&E and CLA activities outlined in Section 7? B) If the answer is yes, could USAID confirm that bidders should use CLIN 005 for Monitoring and Evaluation as shown in Section B.4 to account for this M&E and CLA activity?

Response: A) Yes, USAID confirms that it anticipates approximately 10% of the overall effort being put toward the M&E and CLIN 005 under section B.4 is the appropriate CLIN to represent this. Please note however that the template under Section B.4 entitled “Budget” shall only be populated by USAID at contract award. B) Offerors shall therefore not provide any Summary CLIN budget information using this template. Offerors shall provide all budget information under solicitation attachment J.10 entitled “Budget Template” which has been revised in this Amendment to the Solicitation. **See revised attachment J.10 entitled “Budget Template.”**

24) Section B4. BUDGET (pg 8) asked that subcontracts line item be categorized as a separate total from Component 1, 2, 3 and Monitoring and Evaluation, while the subcontractors line item are placed under each of the component under Attachment_J_10_-_Budget_format(1).xlsx .Please provide guidance on how to account for subcontractor line item per Section B4. BUDGET (pg 8).

[Response: See response to question 22 & 23 above.](#)

25) On page 8 of the RFP, Section B.4 Budget includes the following line items:

- CLIN 001 Component 1
- CLIN 002 Component 2
- CLIN 003 Component 2 –Learning Opportunities
- CLIN 004 Component 3
- CLIN 005 Monitoring and Evaluation
- CLIN 006 Sub Contracts
- CLIN 007 Other Direct Costs*
- CLIN 008 Indirect Costs
- CLIN 009 Fixed Fee

However, Attachment J.10 Budget Format, shows the costs broken out into four components:

Component 1

Component 2 (which includes the learning Opportunities)

Component 3

M&E

Within the above, sub contracts, cross-cutting other direct costs, indirect costs, and fixed fee are elements within each of the 4 components.

In order to facilitate review and consolidate the budget submission (to avoid submitting two sets of budgets, one with 9 sub-budgets and one with 4 sub-budgets), would USAID consider amending Section B.4 to include only the four (4) items listed in the Attachment J.10 (Components 1, 2 and 3, and M&E)?

[Response: See response to question 22 & 23 above.](#)

- 26) Regarding the budget template in section B.4, Page 8 of 114: If prime contractors include subcontractor cost in the CLIN 006 "Sub Contracts" line item, CLINs 001-004 will likely be under-represented. For example, if a prime contractor subcontracts the performance of Component 3, then the CLIN 004 line item will reflect \$0 budget with the subcontracts line item. Is this the intention of USAID? or should Costs associated with Components 1-3 be included in CLINs 001-004 leaving subcontracts blank?

Response: Please note that the template under Section B.4 entitled "Budget" shall only be populated by USAID at contract award. Offerors shall therefore not provide any Summary CLIN budget information using this template. Offerors shall provide all budget information under solicitation attachment J.10 entitled "Budget Template." **See revised attachment J.10 entitled "Budget Template."**

- 27) Could you please clarify the evaluation points associated with the Technical Approach, Key Personnel, Past Performance and Institutional Capability?

Response: The technical proposal evaluation criteria are presented below in **DESCENDING ORDER** of importance. Sub criteria as indicated in Section M of the solicitation are equally weighted. Refer to Section M.3.1 entitled "Technical Evaluation Criteria."

- ✚ Technical Approach;
- ✚ Key Personnel;
- ✚ Institutional Capability
- ✚ Past Performance.

- 28) Regarding evaluation criteria, is there a weighting for each of the four criteria?

Response: See response to question 27 above.

- 29) Reference: Section E.4, Monitoring and Evaluation, Page 30 of 114, Paragraph 2. The last sentence states, "The COR and CO will discuss the COR recommendations and the CO will approve or disapprove the payment of fee." The solicitation indicates the government will award a Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee (CPFF) contract; how does the government anticipate that the described performance assessment will function within the framework of a CPFF contract?

Response: Part I, Section E.4 entitled "Monitoring and Evaluation": Delete in its entirety the last sentence of paragraph 2 that states as follows: "The COR and CO will discuss the COR recommendations, and the CO will approve or disapprove the payment of fee".

See revised solicitation section PART I: Section E.4 entitled "Monitoring and Evaluation."

- 30) On page 30 of the RFP in Section E.4 Monitoring and Evaluation, it discusses a milestone plan and states:

“The Contractor shall submit to the COR, for technical review, all information and appropriate documentation necessary to demonstrate and support the achievement of milestones. The Contractor shall also provide an explanation and/or justification if any milestones have not been achieved according to the schedule. The COR will lead a review of the documentation to determine if the milestones have been met. The COR and CO will discuss the COR recommendations, and the CO will approve or disapprove the payment of fee.”

Since the proposed contract would be Cost Plus Fixed Fee (vs. Cost Plus Award Fee) in accordance with Section B.2., we respectfully request that the reference to payment of fee in relation to a milestone plan be deleted.

[Response: See response to question 29 above.](#)

- 31) Regarding the budget template in section B4, Page 8 of 114 and L.9(B)(2)(I), page 104 of 114: Is it USAID's intent that the costs associated with "Direct Facilities Cost" be assigned to CLIN 007 "Other Direct Costs" or be divided according to estimated portion of the work assigned to that activity?

[Response: Only facilities that directly benefit the program activities shall be represented in CLIN 007; all other facility costs shall be included in the indirect cost category. Refer to Section L.9 entitled “Cost/Business Proposal Instructions”.](#)

- 32) On page 97 of 114, section L.8 (a), the RFP states that "the technical proposal shall be organized by the technical evaluation criteria listed in Section M." However, the guidance found at L.8 "Instructions for the Preparation of the Technical Proposal", subpart (A) "Technical Approach" on pages 98 to 100" appears to be a more logical approach for demonstrating an offeror's capabilities and proposed approach.-

[Response: Section M provides the evaluation criteria against which the Offerors' proposals shall be evaluated. Proposals shall be evaluated against all sub criteria as listed in section M.3.1 and must therefore address all sub criteria as listed. Instructions for the preparation of the technical Approach, Key Personnel, Institutional Capability and Past Performance essentially provide guidance as to what shall be addressed in the Offerors technical proposal in order to meet the requirements of the evaluation criteria. See revised Section L.8: Part A entitled “Technical Approach” and revised Section M Sub Section M.3: Criterion 1 entitled “Technical Approach”.](#)

- 33) Can USAID confirm that notwithstanding the language found at L.8 (a), offerors are to present their Technical Approaches following the outline at L8, subpart (A) "Technical Approach"

[Response: See response to question 32 above.](#)

- 34) Could you please clarify the evaluation points associated with the Technical Approach, Key Personnel, Past Performance and Institutional Capability?

Response: The technical proposal evaluation criteria are presented below in **DESCENDING ORDER** of importance. Sub criteria are **EQUALLY WEIGHTED**. Refer to Section M.3.1 entitled "Technical Evaluation Criteria."

- ✚ Technical Approach;
- ✚ Key Personnel;
- ✚ Institutional Capability and
- ✚ Past Performance.

Please note that the quantitative point scoring evaluation method will not be used on this solicitation.

- 35) Section C.5.1 of the solicitation does provide weights for the program components, but there does not appear to be a weight assigned to past performance. Request that proposal evaluation weights be provided in Section M, please.

Response: See response to question 34 above.

- 36) Would USAID consider providing plug-figures for Travel costs, and Training and event costs?

Response: The Offeror should propose a reasonable estimate of costs for travel, training & events that you anticipate will be required during the period of implementation that adequate reflects your technical approach.

- 37) Are the existing prime and subcontractors implementing the USAID-funded programs in Uganda eligible to submit a proposal in response to the Monitoring, evaluation and Learning Program RFP, or would this constitute a conflict of interest?

Response: Current USAID partners and subs are not restricted from participating in this solicitation unless it is deemed that the partner or sub has an organizational conflict of interest (OCI) which at this time cannot be determined. USAID/Uganda will treat any issues arising from potential OCI on a case-by-case basis.

- 38) Can a firm with current prime contracting responsibilities on a USAID Uganda project bid on this RFP without facing a potential conflict of interest?

Response: See response to question 37 above.

- 39) If there is a potential conflict of interest, would it apply to a sub-contractor conducting activities only under Component Two and related to the learning element of the contract?

Response: USAID/Uganda will treat any issues arising from potential OCI on a case-by-case.

40) How would a potential conflict of interest apply to or affect a potential sub-contractor if they did not directly conduct an evaluation under this contract?

[Response: See response to question 39 above.](#)

41) Would the potential contractor(s), sub or prime, be evaluating or creating a learning strategy related to current programs that would create a conflict of interest or ineligibility to bid on a successor program?

[Response: See response to question 39 above.](#)

42) What is USAID's plan to avoid and/or minimize conflict of interest that would arise from contractor(s) in the roles of sub or prime a) bidding on future programs that are designed as a result of the evaluations done under this contract and b) having insider information that could compromise the integrity of future bids?

[Response: See response to question 39 above.](#)

43) On page 98, a Brief Explanation of the selected method Electronic Payment is listed as Annex G of the Technical Proposal. Can you please confirm that this should indeed be included as an Annex to the Technical Proposal vs. in the Cost/Business Proposal?

[Response: A brief explanation of the selected method of electronic payments is required to be submitted as Annex G to the technical proposal and not the cost proposal and is not part of the 30 page technical proposal limit. Although encouraged for offerors considering the use of electronic payments in their operations and programs, please note that the submission of this information is not mandatory and shall not be an evaluation factor. Refer to Section L.10 entitled "Electronic Payments"](#)

44) (Reference: Section L, p. 101) If proposing a major subcontractor, are they required to provide up to 5 past performance references in addition to the prime's 5 past performance references? What is the total number of references required?

[Response: Yes. In addition to the Offeror's 5 past performance references, 5 past performance references shall also be provided for each major subcontractor whose proposed cost equals 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed cost or any subcontractor which shall have principle responsibility for implementing one or more of the program components/deliverables or results area regardless of dollar value. Refer to Section L.8 Part D entitled "Past Performance."](#)

45) Page 101 under D) Past Performance, please confirm whether Annex C shall include five (5) contracts per organization (i.e. Offeror and each major subcontractor), or five (5) contracts in total.

[Response: See response to question 44 above.](#)

46) In Annex C, are applicants to provide five contracts total for the entire consortium, or rather five contracts for each consortium member?

[Response: See response to question 44 above.](#)

47) Section L.9 “Cost/Business Proposal Instructions”, please confirm that only major subcontractors need to provide Representation and Certifications and Other Statement of offeror, and Information Concerning Work-Day, Work-Week, and Paid Absences.

[Response: To the extent possible, representations and certifications shall be submitted for the Offeror and each proposed subcontractor.](#)

48) On page 101 of the RFP, in Section L.8 Instructions for the preparation of the Technical Proposal, Subsection 3 Technical Proposal, it states:

“Management Plan: The Offeror shall describe the planned management of the award, explain the planned institutional management structure and systems for financial and logistics management. The offeror shall submit an organizational chart (Annex E) that reflects the optimum use of Key Personnel and other staff to achieve program objectives. The offeror shall include a sub-contracting plan, if any, and a table showing the planned level of effort or number of person months for each position proposed, including any short-term consultancies.”

On page 98 of 114 of the RFP, it states that Annex E (Management structure organization charts) is 1 page maximum.

We have the following related questions:

Would you please confirm that Annex E should include?

An Organizational Chart

A Sub-contracting Plan, if any

An LOE table

If yes, we respectfully request that the page limit for Annex E be increased to 4 pages to allow sufficient space to present these three separate items.

[Response: Annex E shall include the above information and its page limit has been increased to 4 pages maximum.](#)

[See revised solicitation PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled: “Annexes shall be presented in the following order”, Annex E entitled: “Management Structure Organizational Charts”](#)

- 49) Further to the question immediately above, resumes are limited to 3 pages. Can you please confirm that the reference information is not included in the page limit and may be included on a fourth page?

Response: Within a maximum of three pages ONLY, Offerors shall submit current resumes including contact information of up to 3 references for each identified key personnel. For each key personnel, letters of commitment shall not exceed one page maximum and shall not be counted as part of the 3 page resume and reference information limit.

- 50) Please confirm that U.S. Permanent Residents are eligible for allowance and differentials.

Response: U.S. citizens Permanent Resident of Uganda are NOT eligible for the same allowances and differentials as offshore U.S. citizen hires.

- 51) Section L.7 (page 95) indicates that proposals should be submitted via email “with up to 3 attachments (2MB limit) per email...” Does the 2MB size limit refer to a single attachment (totaling a 6MB limit per email with the maximum number of attachments), or to the entire email including all attachments?

Response: The 2MB size limit refers to a single attachment totaling a 6MB limit per email with a maximum number of three attachments. Offerors can submit proposals broken up into multiple email attachments but not to exceed three (3) attachments per email and 2 MB per attachment.

- 52) Section L.9.1 on cost proposals mentioned that the offeror and each subcontractor shall complete all “Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offeror” as required in Section K. Neither Section I or Section K mention the use of the new SAM system in regards to CCR and ORCA certification. Request clarification please. In addition, does SAM (or CCR/ORCA) apply to non-US subcontractors?

Response: The new System for Award Management (SAM) is combining federal procurement systems and the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance into one new system. The first phase of SAM includes the functionality from the following systems:

- ✚ Central Contractor Registry (CCR)
- ✚ Federal Agency Registration (Fedreg)
- ✚ Online Representations and Certifications Application
- ✚ Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)

ANY ENTITY wishing to do business with the federal government under a Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)-based contract or applying for federal grants, cooperative agreements or other forms of federal financial assistance through Grants.gov must be registered in SAM. Entities should also, consider creating a SAM account if they wish to utilize the full set of capabilities that have been developed in SAM and/or migrated from

legacy systems (CCR, FedReg, ORCA and EPLS). If an entity had an active record in CCR, it has an active record in SAM and does not need to do anything in SAM at this time, unless a change in your business circumstances requires updates to your Entity record(s) in order for you to be paid or to receive an award or you need to renew your Entity(s) prior to its expiration. SAM will send notifications to the registered user via email 60, 30, and 15 days prior to expiration of the Entity. To update or renew your Entity records(s) in SAM you will need to create a SAM User Account and link it to your migrated Entity records. You do not need a user account to search for registered entities in SAM by typing the DUNS number or business name into the search box. For more information, please visit <https://www.sam.gov>. Please note that Entities need a DUNS to register in SAM. If an entity does not have a DUNS number, they can request a DUNS number for free by visiting D&B at <http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform>. It takes 1-2 business days to obtain a DUNS.

53) Should the most recent version of 52.204-7 CENTRAL CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION (AUG. 2012) be included in I.5?

Response: Yes and see response to question 52 above.

54) Please confirm that the requirements found at L.9. (b) (4) for major subcontractors to submit a NICRA, balance sheet, and PNL statements do not apply to commercial item subcontractors.

Response: Correct, as long as the commercial item subcontractor is not being awarded a cost-reimbursement contract.

55) Page 101 Section D (a.2) please clarify what is meant by "skills/experience required" for past performances?

Response: For five (5) of the most recent and relevant contracts for efforts similar to the size and scope in the subject proposal, Offerors shall provide for each of the contracts listed information regarding skills/expertise required to provide the service. The offeror shall describe the types of personnel (skill and expertise) used and the overall quality of the contractor's team.

56) In Annex C, for each of the contracts listed, what kind of information should be included under "(4) skills/ expertise required"?

Response: See response to question 55 above.

57) Paragraph L8(c) of the RFP's Instructions for the Preparation of the Technical Proposal refers to "past performance report forms." Can you please specify which particular form you would like us to use?

Response: This refers to the matrix of past performance references.

58) Please confirm that total under "Component 2" per Section B4. BUDGET (pg 8) excludes Learning Opportunities plugged figure of \$1,500,000.

Response: CLIN 002- Correct.

59) If the offeror follows budget categories outlined in Attachment J_10, please confirm that allowances (Section H) subtotal as stated on page 103 should be categorized under "Other Direct cost" per template provided in Attachment_J_10_-_Budget_format(1).xlsx

Response: Personnel allowances shall form part of the labor cost category on the budget summary sheet provided under attachment J.10. The labor shall be further broken out on a separate sheet entitled "Detail Prime" under attachment J.10 to reflect all its constituent costs for which personnel allowances shall be part. The labor costs shall then form part of the Offerors Total Direct Costs line item. Please note that allowances shall not form part of Other Direct Costs line item.

60) If the offeror follows budget categories outlined in Attachment J_10, please confirm that the (D) Procurement subtotal and (F) Communication subtotal as stated on page 103 should be categorized under "Other Direct cost" per template provided in Attachment_J_10_-_Budget_format(1).xlsx.

Response: Proposed non expendable property purchases/procurements shall form part of the equipment cost category on the budget summary sheet provided under attachment J.10. The equipment cost category shall be further broken out on a separate sheet entitled "Detail Prime" under attachment J.10 to reflect all its constituent costs. The equipment costs shall then form part of the Offerors' Total Direct Costs line item. Please note that non expendable property purchases/procurements shall not form part of Other Direct Costs line item. Lastly, the Offeror should clearly provide sufficient information in the budget narrative that is to accompany the Cost Proposal to allow USAID to understand the basis for the amounts included in the budget.

61) Per Section L, Offerors are directed to organize the technical proposal by the technical evaluation criteria listed in Section M. Criterion 1 in Section M orders the components of the Learning Contract differently than in Section C; Section L, 3A, follows the order of the components in Section C. Might USAID consider modifying the order in Criterion 1 of Section M to follow Sections C and L?

Response: See modified Solicitation Section M Sub Section M.3: Criterion 1 entitled "Technical Approach".

62) Can USAID please provide USAID/Uganda's organizational structure and staffing composition?

Response: USAID/Uganda is organized as follows:

- a) Office of the Mission Director
- b) Development Objective 1 (DO1) – Economic Growth & Agriculture
- c) Development Objective 2 (DO2) – Democracy, Governance & Conflict
- d) Development Objective 3 (DO3) – Health, HIV/AIDS & Education
- e) Gula Field Office
- f) Program and Policy Development Office (PPD)
- g) Office of Acquisition & Assistance (OAA)
- h) Executive Office (EXO)
- i) Office of Financial Management (OFM)

Composition of each office is a mix of Foreign Service Officers, Foreign Service Nationals, and Third-Country Nationals in technical and support functions.

63) Can USAID please provide information on USAID/Uganda's current HR performance management system? As part of that system, is there a competencies framework established and in use?

Response: FSN employees' performance is evaluated against the performance factors listed their evaluation forms: they are Dependability, Job Knowledge and Skills, Initiative and Resourcefulness, Judgment, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Adaptability, Decisiveness, Interpersonal Relationships, and Supervisory Skills.

The critical thinking, leadership, and learning capacities etc. factor below can be enforced during the time when work objectives are being developed and performance is managed in a manner that targets these particular performance factors.

64) What is an "expanded team meeting"? (p. 24)

Response: Each technical team i.e. the Economic Growth team, Democracy, Governance and Conflict team and the Health, HIV/AIDS and Education team holds weekly meetings to share updates and identify work priorities for the coming period. Expanded team meetings are those that may include representatives from other offices including a Contractor, in this case the Learning Contractor. The frequency and issues of discussion for such meetings are agreed upon with the specific Team Director.

65) Please clarify whether the Learning Contractor will carry out evaluations? If so, is there an assumption on the number and type of evaluations per year?

Response: The Learning Contractor shall need to be prepared to conduct periodic evaluations. The Mission's PMP, now attached to this solicitation, includes an illustrative evaluation plan. Besides the performance evaluations, USAID expects this contract to offer a wide range of studies/assessments, reviews and smaller, rapid, participatory learning exercises in response to specific information demands from the Mission as they arise. Note that impact evaluations will be conducted by other independent contractors besides the Learning Contractor.

66) Can USAID provide an estimation of how many evaluations and assessments are planned for the first year of this contract?

Response: See response to question 65 above. Actual, formal evaluations may not be conducted as often as smaller, rapid, participatory learning exercises.

67) Can USAID/Uganda provide a comprehensive list of programs to be evaluated by the potential contractor(s)?

Response: See response to question 65 above.

68) Page 99, respective to Component 2, it states "Addressing the questions cited in section C.8.2..." but section C.8 does not have sub-sections.

Response: The Solicitation has been modified to remove the above quoted statement that makes reference to section C.8.2.

69) Can the PMPs be made available for each Mission Development Objective and the overall Mission PMP? To include the "Learning Agendas" referred to in the RFP.

Response: USAID/Uganda's PMP is now included as attachment J.17 to this solicitation but learning agendas are not yet available. The Learning Contract will play a central role in updating and or finalizing these agendas.

70) On page 16 of the RFP there is mention of the Mission's PMP, but it was not included as an attachment in Section J. Could you please provide offerors with the Mission's PMP?

Response: See response to question 69 above.

71) Please provide Offerors copies of the Mission DO PMPs.

Response: See response to question 69 above.

72) Please provide Offerors with the DO Teams' Learning Agenda.

Response: These are still under development from respective DO teams and not yet available.

73) Page 26 of the RFP requests that Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialists have at least 10 years of experience in M&E. However, if candidates possess experience that is directly relevant to this solicitation in areas such as policy research, knowledge management or sector experience, could this count towards the 10 year threshold?

Response: The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist shall have specific experience in M&E as stated in the solicitation. While policy research, knowledge management or sector experience can count towards this, they do not fully substitute the specific sector M&E experience expected from such senior M&E specialists.

74) On page 26 of the RFP, in Section C 9.2 b) Other Key Personnel, it states: "Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialists shall have: A minimum of ten years of progressively responsible professional experience in monitoring and evaluation in the areas of Health, Democracy, Governance and Conflict, Economic and Agricultural development." Can you please confirm that candidates who have a combined minimum of 10 years of M&E experience in two or more of these areas would meet this criterion?

Response: Yes.

75) For the M&E Advisers, can additional experience and post-graduate certificates substitute for a graduate degree?

Response: No.

76) Would USAID consider splitting the Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management Adviser into two separate positions?

Response: Although USAID/Uganda perceives these roles to be inherently linked and best executed as a consolidated position, USAID recognizes that it can be challenging to find experienced professionals who traverse several sub-disciplines and as such, Offerors shall make their best proposal addressing the requirements of the Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management Advisor position. Offerors that propose to split this role should however note that only the Organizational Learning Advisor position shall be key personell.

See Revision to PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled "The Technical Proposal Shall Include the Following Information"; Part B entitled "Key Personnel."

77) Regarding the budget template in section B4, Page 8 of 114: CLIN 005 is described as "Monitoring and Evaluation." Could USAID describe what should be included in this CLIN and how it differs from CLIN 001 "Component 1" which is the component inclusive of programs related to "Strengthened Monitoring and Evaluation Function"?

Response: CLIN 001 covers costs related to strengthening monitoring and evaluation functions in USAID as described under Component 1 whereas CLIN 005 refers to costs of activities and efforts geared at assessing the progress, results and impact of the monitoring, evaluation and learning program.

78) Can USAID provide information on the status of the District Operational Plans?

Response: District Operational Plans (DOPs) have only started with nearly 19 Mission focus districts. DOPs are meant to enhance localization and coordination of USAID, and eventually other actors', development assistance efforts which would advance respective districts development plans, gradually transferring responsibilities for managing more harmonious development efforts to local district authorities and citizens.

79) Contractors may need to access the PRS throughout the development of their technical proposals. Would USAID consider keeping the PRS website open through January 11, 2013

Response: The PRS website is now open through a dummy site accessible at the following link: http://memsdatabase.com/uganda_prs_test/. The dummy site shall be accessible to all interested parties with effect from January 18, 2013 through to February 8, 2013 using the following log in information: Username = testaccount Password = Ugand@1 (The password is case sensitive).

80) In Section B.4, USAID provides a plug-figure for Learning Opportunities that will support Component 2. Given the flexible nature of the Learning Contract, certain costs are difficult to predict accurately for budgeting purposes. For example, on page 15, the RFP states that the contractor "shall pursue one of three types of performance reporting system solutions." The three options outlined in the SOW would all have different cost components and total costs. Would USAID consider providing a plug-figure for Information Technology costs associated with upgrading the PRS in order to eliminate potential cost variance among bidders due to wide-ranging assumptions?

Response: Based upon the questions submitted, USAID/Uganda agrees that an amount not to exceed \$500,000 should be utilized by all Offerors in determining how to budget for all work, including assessment of the existing system and Mission needs, development of recommended solutions, roll out and maintenance of a selected system, related to the performance reporting system.

Offerors are at this time not required to provide a cost break down of this figure. See revised solicitation Part I Section B.4 entitled "Budget" and PART IV: Section L.8 Subtitled "The Technical Proposal Shall Include the Following Information", Part A entitled "Technical Approach" Sub Part b entitled "Proposed Interventions": Respective to component 1.

81) Can USAID/Uganda specify how it would like offerors to address the three different Performance Reporting System (PRS) options in regard to both the technical and cost proposals? Each option requires a different approach, and each will have considerably different budget implications. Which option should the Offeror address in its proposal?

Response: See response to question 80 above.

82) The preferred type of PRS is not defined in the RFP. This means that the Government will have to consider and evaluate a myriad of systems (upgraded PRS, newly designed and inserted PRS, or AID Tracker listed on page 15) offered by the respondents. How will the Evaluation Committee directly compare and evaluate such a wide range of reporting system solution sets? Will uniform detailed technical criteria be applied to all? If so, will USAID please provide those criteria or technical specifications?

[Response: See response to question 80 above.](#)

83) RFP Section C 5.1.1 (page 15) states that “USAID/Uganda reserves the right to award a separate contract for any substantive IT work, if necessary. In collaboration with USAID’s Information Office, the Mission—in collaboration with this prime Contractor shall initiate the mandatory independent validation and verification to examine the cost effectiveness and efficiency of any planned modifications and enhancements to the current reporting system.” This seems to present a fourth option related to question 4 above. If the Mission opts for this option, can it provide guidance about the requirements related to the PRS that offerors are expected to address?

[Response: See response to question 80 above.](#)

84) What technology requirements or constraints exist in terms of enhancing or revamping the PRS? Can the Government provide reference technical documents on the PRS?

[Response: A technical description of the PRS is contained in attachment J16. Other information on the current condition and issues related to its use can be found in the statement of work and final evaluation UMEMS program in attachment J-14.](#)

85) A) What is the estimated volume of data housed in the current PRS? B) If a new system were being proposed, would all of the existing data need to be migrated to the new system?

[Response: A\) 1206 = files 143 MB & Database = 299 MB.](#)

[B\) Yes, all data shall eventually be migrated into the new system.](#)

86) Regarding the GIS requirements of the PRS, please clarify what percentage of the indicators in the PRS are associated to “fixed” administrative areas (represented by polygon maps, such as districts) and what percentage of the PRS indicators need to be associated to specific coordinate pairs (represented by point maps, such as schools, health facilities, etc.)?

[Response: To USAID’s knowledge, there are an estimated 1,976 indicators within the PRS, tracking progress of Mission Development Objectives, specific projects and activities. It is not known at this point of time exactly what percentage is associated to administrative areas vs. specific coordinate pairs.](#)

87) Who (what organization or entity) will maintain the PRS after the contract completion date?

Response: USAID remains the full steward of the PRS and further post-contract maintenance will be determined at a later time.

88) On page 101, Section L requires a Management Plan in the Institutional Capability section. However, the Management Plan does not appear to be scored based on page 111 in Section M's Criterion 3. Could USAID confirm that the Management Plan should be a forth sub-criterion for scoring the bidder's Institutional Capability.

Response: See modified Solicitation Section M Sub Section M.3: Criterion 3 entitled "Institutional Capability".

89) Attachments J.1 through J.9 provide additional background and insight into USAID/Uganda's operations and the Learning Contract. Throughout these attachments, there are requirements stated that are not contained in Section C. For example, Should bidders assume that the requirements stated in the attachments are equal in importance to those stated in Section C?

Response: No, the core requirements are stated in Section C. The attachments are primarily meant to provide complimentary background and insights into USAID's operations and key challenges.

90) Attachment J-6 discusses District Operational Plans (DOP) and states "See Section 4.0 for a full explanation of the DOP concept and how it relates to CLA and this Learning Contract." Could you please clarify what "Section 4.0" is being referred to, or provide the DOP explanation?

Response: Please disregard this reference. DOPs are meant to enhance localization and coordination of USAID, and eventually other actors', development assistance efforts which would advance respective districts development plans, gradually transferring responsibilities for managing more harmonious development efforts to local district authorities and citizens. Please refer to attachment J-6 for a broader explanation of DOP.

91) A) Does the estimated cost range of \$15 million to \$17.5 million include impact evaluations, and surveys? B) If so, how many of each does USAID/Uganda anticipate including in this contract?

Response: A) No. It does not include costs for conducting impact evaluations but includes costs for conducting periodic surveys, studies and performance evaluations.

B) See response to question 65 above.

92) How many performance evaluations and 'proof of concept' studies does USAID/Uganda anticipate over the life of the contract?

Response: See response to question 65 above.

93) What do the percentages represent for the three components and for monitoring, evaluation and CLA in Section C?

Response: The percentages represent the relative level of effort prospective Offerors shall consider when proposing interventions, methods, developing proposals and associating resources and management interests around these areas.

94) Would USAID consider modifying the outline in Section L c) Performance Plan to "Monitoring, Evaluation and CLA", as stated in Section C of the RFP and clarifying the instructions, since Section C 7.1 (Monitoring, Evaluation and CLA) deals with more than the PMP, i.e., 7.2 M&E, 7.3 Collaboration, Learning, and Adaption, 7.4 and Sustainability? (FYI there is no "Section C 7.0", only 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4).

Response: See revised section L.8 Sub Part c) now entitled "Monitoring, Evaluation and CLA".

95) Section L only calls for a PMP as an Annex. Should any narrative associated with the PMP per Section C 7.2 be in the annex as well?

Response: Yes. See modified Solicitation Section C Sub Section 7.1 entitled "Monitoring & Evaluation" as well as section L.8 Part C entitled "Performance Management Plan (PMP)".

96) Will evaluations be funded outside of this contract or from contract funds?

Response: Performance evaluations conducted by the Learning Contractor will be funded from this contract funds. The Contractor, in establishing PMP targets for evaluations shall take into account the mission's PMP targets now attached to this solicitation as Annex J.17. See response to question 65 above.

97) Please provide a calendar of expected evaluations of all types.

Response: See response to question 65 above.

98) What is the status of the AID Tracker system and what is the likelihood it will be adopted by the Agency?

Response: USAID/Uganda is not aware of the most recent developments with AID Tracker. However, USAID has recently launched a Dollars to Results website which may well be a related endeavor.

99) What are the special monitoring and reporting requirements of the PMI and FtF initiatives that distinguish them from the requirements for other activities?

Response: More information on Feed the Future M&E requirements can be found at the following link on the FTF website; <http://feedthefuture.gov/progress> and the Presidential Malaria initiative website.

100) Please provide information about the FtF FEEDBACK mechanism as none is available on the FtF website.

Response: FEEDBACK is currently collecting baseline information for FTF high level indicators for this Mission, with results due by early 2013. This information will be collected again at the mid term and at the end of strategy. In early 2013, FEEDBACK will also start work on the final design of one of the Mission's impact evaluations.

101) Please provide information on the GIS system currently in place at the Mission - software, hardware, sources of data/GIS coordinates and system for obtaining GIS data.

Response: Refer to attachment J.12.

102) On page 32 (Deliverables), 1st paragraph, the RFP states that "...an organizational learning and M&E systems assessment within 120 days after the award...". In the 2nd paragraph, the RFP states "...and a final report will be due not later than 90 days after the award..." Would USAID/Uganda please clarify whether the deadline is 90 days or 120 days?

Response: This was an error. The final report will be due not later than 120 days after the award of the contract. See revised Solicitation Section F.4.1: Sub Section 1.2 entitled "Contractor Deliverables".

103) Is it possible for a potential prime contractor to propose an M&E plan that assumes the M&E related to their contract activities in Uganda will be carried out by USAID directly or separately from this contract?

Response: No, such contractors are still responsible for carrying out their own M&E for this contract and any other contracts they may hold.

104) How closely linked does USAID see the interaction between M&E (Component One) and learning (Component 2) within the project?

Response: Very closely linked.

- 105) Under Component 2, the RFP states that “(t)he Contractor is expected to provide a promising methodology for USAID’s understanding and strengthening learning, leadership and program management styles, time and meeting management and other practices.” Would USAID/Uganda find it acceptable if the methodology proposed was grounded in a non-M&E area of thought or practice?

Response: Yes, and that is the intention of that particular RFP statement, that bidders propose a non-M&E (beyond data collection, reporting and programmatic decision-making) for promoting staff’s learning, leadership and program management aptitudes.

- 106) The RFP states that Component One “...is primarily a set of activities that have been conducted for a number of years under the MEMS contracts...” while it describes Component Two as “addressing USAID/Uganda’s internal practices, attitudes, and openness to promoting learning, change and adaptation...” and comprising a 30% LOE. Would the USAID/Uganda mission be open to receiving an Expression of Interest or proposal under the APS mechanism, or other mechanism, that addresses the issues listed under Component Two as a separate, stand-alone project?

Response: No, it is already part of this RFP

- 107) The RFP contains a large number of acronyms, not all of which are identified in the text. We would be very appreciative if USAID would provide such a list.

Response: USAID does not find this broadly true, in Section C.

- 108) Under Section F.4.1, 4.2 and 4.5, the sequencing of deliverables does not appear to be clear. Shouldn’t the Organizational Learning and Monitoring and Evaluation System Assessment and the Performance Management Plan be completed and approved earlier or at the same time as the First Year’s Annual Work Plan? If major changes are required in the Assessment and PPMP, wouldn’t the Annual Work Plan also need revision? Request clarification on the sequencing of these documents, please.

Response: Response: The deliverables are proposed to be staged in a logical manner. Draft work plans and PMPs will be due before the Learning and Systems Assessment is fully completed, however, final work plan and PMP will be influenced from the findings of the assessment.

- 109) In Section C.9.2. Personnel Requirements - a. Chief of Party, the solicitation requires that the COP have “especially charismatic, professional credentials.” What are the Mission’s criteria for determining whether a COP candidate has such credentials? Are there specific adjectives or characteristics that we should be demonstrating in support of the charismatic credentials of our candidate?

Response: Objectively defining professionals projecting charismatic qualities that are observed to be experienced as present and positively shared among a wide range of people is often difficult. At the same time, these qualities are commonly associated with demonstrated success in influencing, leading, collaborating and catalyzing change within complex environments, for example. Such qualities are sometimes developed from years of cultivating intra and inter-personal awareness and usually attractive mannerisms that, among other benefits, can soon capture audiences’ interest, trust and confidence. It is not a hard ‘requirement’ that the COP demonstrates charisma and appreciation of self as an instrument of change for promoting organizational development, but it is desirable and one reason USAID/Uganda shall contemplate having final, oral presentations from prospective bidders to estimate the temperament and personalities of such senior project staff.

- 110) If the emphasis on charisma applies to personality or presentation, this would be only truly apparent in a face-to-face meeting with the proposed COP. Per FAR 15.102(a) (Oral presentations), would the Government consider holding these oral presentations prior to the announcement of the Competitive Range?

Response: For purposes of efficiency, USAID/Uganda shall contemplate the use of oral presentations only for those Offerors included in the competitive range.

- 111) Reference: Section L.8.3.A, respective of Component 2, Page 99 of 114. The text reads, "Addressing the questions cited in Section C.8.2..." There is no Section C.8.2 in the solicitation. Should the text read, "Addressing the questions cited in C.7.2"?

Response: Response: The Solicitation has been modified to remove the above quoted statement that makes reference to section C.8.2. The questions cited in C.7.2 are overarching questions the contractor shall consider addressing in their proposal for advancing research and learning.

- 112) Page 99, respective to Component 2, it states “Addressing the questions cited in section C.8.2...” but section C.8 does not have sub-sections.

Response: See response to question 111 above.

- 113) In Section L on page of the RFP, there is a reference to questions respective to Component 2 cited in Section C.8.2, but there does not appear to be a Section C.8.2. Can you please confirm that this should refer to Section C.7.2?

Response: See response to question 111 above.

114) The Instructions in Section L.2. b) it says, “Respective to Component 2: Addressing the questions cited in Section C.8.2, the Offeror shall.....”. There is no Section C 8.2. What is the correct reference?

[Response: See response to question 111 above.](#)

115) If the correct reference is Section C.7.3, (Collaboration, Learning and Adapting) instead of C.8.2, they should be addressed under Component 2?

[Response: See response to question 111 above.](#)